

The Catholic Church and Modern Science

REV. THOMAS F. COAKLEY, D.D.

Wireless Sermon, Preached at Pittsburgh, Pa.

*"The wise men will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients."
(Ecclesiastes, XXXIX, 1-5).*

THERE is a widespread impression that there is an essential and necessary opposition between science and religion. This unfortunate opinion prevails, not merely among the learned, such as college and university professors, literary and professional men, and those who have enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education; it is found also among those who have been badly educated, partially educated, or not educated at all. The so-called "man-in-the-street," those who read nothing at all but the daily newspapers and the cheap popular magazines, are convinced that there is an irreconcilable conflict between modern science and ancient Christianity, and the discussions with which the newspapers have been filled for many weeks add further to this erroneous impression. And to avoid any misunderstanding, let me state once for all, that in the following remarks, when I employ the word "science" I mean physical science, for theology itself is also a science. The results of this idea of a conflict obtaining root in men's minds have been unfortunate in a two-fold respect. An unreasoning prejudice has been created against religion by half educated students, partially instructed propagandists, and quack scientists. On the other hand, it has caused a no less marked prejudice against physical science by those who know little about it, but who fear, somehow or other, either that science and Christianity are incompatible, or that science one day may supplant ancient historic Christianity, and that the cherished beliefs of ages will one day become outworn and discarded. The panic fear engendered in some quarters revealed a situation almost unique in American annals. It has, in one notable instance, witnessed an attempt to bring the State into a close alliance with the Church. It brought about the introduction of a bill into the legislature of Kentucky to prohibit the teaching of evolution in the colleges and universities of

that State. The bill was defeated a few days ago; but the discussion it provoked bears witness to the tremors in the minds of those earnest religious zealots who sponsored it, lest the advance of science mark the retrogression of religion.

NARROW MINDED FANATICS

Those who are fond of continually bringing up the little understood case of Galileo will do well to keep in mind the famous Kentucky instance of the State endeavoring to stifle intellectual activity, and to control thought. Once upon a time it was thought that such things could only be done in the so-called Dark Ages; but we see today in the fierce white light of the twentieth century a body of Kentucky legislators, many of them with but meagre education, and all of them prating of liberty, trying to stifle the activity of the human mind. Governor Berkeley, of Virginia, did the same thing in the seventeenth century, when he destroyed the only printing press in the English colonies, and hoped there would be no free schools for 100 years. History is again repeating itself, and it should serve as a warning to us, lest our freedom be imperiled by narrow minded fanatics acting under the cloak of religion.

The Catholic Church encourages scientific research. The case of Galileo is no instance of the opposition of the Church to science. Galileo had no trouble as long as he kept out of the sacristy, and refrained from using the Bible as a scientific document. Most of Galileo's friends were churchmen. He encountered difficulty only when he began ridiculing Holy Scripture for its supposed antiquated scientific theories, forgetting that the Bible is not a book of science. The Bible teaches us how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go. When Galileo kept within the confines of his own scientific field, he was befriended by Popes and Cardinals throughout his life and until his death.

Propagandists and popular writers on scientific and religious subjects have done much to create the false impression of a conflict between science and religion, and the theory of evolution has been seized upon as a ready weapon of assault upon the foundations of Christianity.

One of the foremost writers of this sort is Mr. H. G. Wells, and I now quote you from his book, "An Outline of History," p. 954, to show the reason for the eagerness of certain literary men and scientific propagandists to popularize the evolutionary theory. That reason Mr. Wells gives so plainly and so openly that all may understand its import. He says and I am quoting his own very words: "If all the animals and man had been evolved in this ascendant manner, then there had been no first parents, no Eden, and no Fall. And if there had been no Fall, then the entire historical fabric of Christianity, the story of the first sin and the reason for an atonement, upon which the current teaching based Christian emotion and morality, collapsed like a house of cards."

WHY SOME CLAIM APE ANCESTORS

That is the reason there has been so much talk about the ape man, and so many abortive efforts to prove man's descent from the gorilla. The modern enemies of Christianity wish us to feel that man has had a brutal ancestry; that he did not come from the hand of God; that he did not sin; that never having sinned, he is constantly growing better through evolutionary processes. Hence there is no need for a God; no necessity for a Christ; no need for a Redemption, or Atonement; no Church; no Sacraments; no reconciliation with a God who does not exist for them. This is one form of the masked attack on Christian belief and practise that concerns not only Catholics, but Christians of whatever form. Hence the pretended antagonism between theology and science is found on examination to lack verification. Real scientists and real theologians are never engaged in a battle. It is only the propagandists, the charlatans, the quacks. Real scientists, like real theologians, are retiring, humble, devout, quiet, respectful, testing their theories for a considerable period before putting them forward as incontestable truths. Such for instance, is Madame Curie, whom we had the honor to entertain in this country last year. But the propagandist, whether he be scientist or theologian, is of quite a different stamp. He is usually a publicity expert, an advertiser. He is noisy, proud, swaggering, irreligious, scoffing, intolerant, rushing into print, constantly putting forward un-

sound and untried views. Such, for instance, is Mr. H. G. Wells, already quoted, who also was a visitor to this country last year, and who for some reason not yet explained suddenly left this country. Between the real scientist and the quack scientist, between the haughty Wells and the humble Madame Curie, there is a gulf so wide that it can never be bridged.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE NOT ENEMIES

The thesis I desire to put before you today is that there is absolutely no opposition between science and religion; that theology and science are not now, never were, and never can be in conflict. This thesis needs substantiation, and the proof is immediately at hand. First of all, truth is the object of knowledge. Now knowledge is of two kinds, natural and supernatural. Natural knowledge is that which we acquire by the aid of human reason alone, by the exercise of our natural powers; for instance, by the use of our five senses.

Supernatural knowledge, on the other hand, is that which we derive from Divine Revelation, that is, by faith. Natural knowledge deals with the seen; supernatural knowledge deals with the unseen. Hence they are separate, distinct, and apart. They differ in three ways: in their nature, in the object, in the methods.

The consequence is that it is possible for us to have a wide acquaintance with one kind of knowledge, without having any idea of the other. It is possible, for instance, to be a first rate scientist without any supernatural faith. It is possible to make the most marvelous scientific experiments, without ever saying a prayer to God, or going to church, or reading the Bible, or doing any of the other things that are customary in one who has divine faith. On the other hand, it is also quite possible to be very religious, to be devout, to have reached a very high scale of virtue, without having any scientific knowledge at all. In brief, it is possible to be a scientist without being a saint; and it is possible to be a saint without being a scientist. The reason is that natural and supernatural knowledge run on parallel lines; they do not meet; they never will meet; consequently there is no conflict either possible or conceivable between them.

So much for the nature of each branch of knowledge. But their distinction will become clearer when we define the object of each. Physical science has for its object brute matter. It begins and ends with matter; it is of the earth, earthy; it is bound up entirely with what falls under the observation of our five senses. We need instruments to work with it; we need a laboratory of some kind; we need apparatus; it is concerned with creatures, with things that we can see and hear and touch and weigh and handle, and subject to our manifold experiments. But so long as the world lasts, physical science will never be able to say a single word about the soul of man. Man's soul is not matter; it is immaterial; it is a spirit, and concerning spirit, science has nothing whatever to say, and it has no instruments to solve any spiritual problem. Science is concerned with the laws that govern the physical universe, but theology is concerned with the great Law-giver Himself, who gave such laws to the universe. Science is concerned with the creature, while theology is concerned with the Creator. Science is concerned with nature, whereas religion is concerned with the Author of nature. Science is concerned with material things, but religion is concerned with those things that are entirely spiritual and immaterial such as God, eternal life, heaven. The consequence is that there can be no jealousy, no dispute between them; there can be neither agreement nor disagreement. There can never be a quarrel, or controversy among them, any more than there could be a conflict between the laws of steam navigation and the laws of portrait painting, for they occupy two entirely separate and distinct fields of knowledge.

More than all this, they differ in their methods. Theology is what is called a deductive science, just like mathematics. In deduction, we have the whole in advance, and then we proceed to draw out, or deduce, the special truths we wish to consider. We compare and study the particular phases in which we are interested. It follows that in such a study there can be no actual and absolute progress, because the process of solving the problem does not add to what was known before. For example, in geometry, the forty-second proposition in Euclid remains the same before we solve it, and afterwards. Our solutions adds

nothing to the sum total of mathematical knowledge. We individually may add to our own personal knowledge of mathematics, but the science of mathematics as a whole is not enlarged by our solution.

It is we who progress by the working out of the theorem, for the conclusion we reach was always contained in the premises, countless centuries before we were born, and independently of any activity on our part. But in physical science it is vastly different. There the inductive method is followed. In science, therefore, we are constantly adding to the world's stock of knowledge, because we did not know it all in advance, as we do in theology. Scientific tests and experiments and research work in laboratories, and the patient labors of careful scientific observers, and the new discoveries constantly being made, are pushing forward the boundaries of scientific knowledge day by day. In science, then, we are still lingering in the vestibule of achievement, whereas in theology, Christ revealed all His doctrines to the Apostles, and after their death, there can be no new doctrines of faith added to the deposit of divine revelation. Theology is complete, a perfect whole, without the possibility of fresh addition thereto.

TRUTH THE OBJECT OF SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY

Truth, then, is the object both of theology and of science, and there can never, by any possibility, be any contradiction between them; no animosity, no envy, no spite, no battle; nay, not even a skirmish. They occupy different realms. One has no terrors for the other; one can never overreach or destroy the other; one can never disturb the other. Theology deals with the spirit of man, with his soul, his Creator, his final destiny, and the means necessary to attain it; whereas science deals with matter, with the world of creatures, with the earth and its laws. Theology is a traditional science, in the sense that it has been handed over to us by God; whereas science is experimental, taking nothing for granted, and testing its way laboriously through all obstacles.

Theology is complete, a perfect whole, while science is incomplete, and constantly reaching out after perfection and completeness. This it is that makes physics and chemistry, for instance, what are called the progressive sciences.

Theology has no need to progress, since it reached its perfection when God delivered His divine truths to His Church. A circle is perfect; you cannot have a more perfect circle; so also with theology. Certainly, there can be new applications of theological principles to the needs of daily life, and to world affairs, but the principles and premises are those given by Christ, and as we all know from the study of logic, the conclusion is ever contained in the premises, hence in that sense there is nothing ever new in theology. Theology, consequently, ever looks to the past, to her Founder, whereas science is constantly looking to the future. Theology makes no guesses, no hypotheses, no conjectures, whereas it is one of the characteristics of science to be putting forward postulates and opinions and guesses, and many of them are very bad guesses, like Mr. Darwin's now abandoned theory of natural selection, or the atomic theory, both of which are now repudiated by all scientists.

Theology is always tranquil; there is no need to hurry, or to be restless, or impatient, whereas science is anxious about the future, and nervous as to results, and often impetuous. Theology is sure and certain in its pronouncements; science is ever tentative and doubtful, that is, in the hands of a real scientist. It is only quacks and charlatans who assume unerring and infallible prerogatives, such, for instance, as Mr. Ernst Haeckel, who utters his unfounded formulas and unsupported opinions with a sort of pontifical dignity. From time to time, it is true, Mr. Haeckel is compelled to retract them, as he did in two celebrated cases, each of them years apart, when he used forged photographs and documents to make up for the lack of honest data. Haeckel, be it remembered, is one of the gods of the evolutionary school; but, today, as ever, all idols have clay feet.

Theology is unchangeable, whereas science is constantly subject to revision, due to the advancing knowledge of nature obtained by scientific research. Theology is consequently infallible, whereas science is liable to many errors, and the text books of science are one long litany of abandoned and repudiated theories, outlawed by succeeding discoveries. Theology is concerned with the cause of facts observable in the universe, while science has noth-

ing to do with causes, but seeks only the facts. In a word theology is the science of religion, the science of God, or the truths we know about God put into a system, and classified, whereas science takes no account of religion whatsoever; it is neither for it nor against it; nor is it even lukewarm towards it. Religion simply does not enter into its field of vision. For instance, whoever heard of the laws of Christian shipbuilding, or the formulas of Christian chemistry, or the units of Christian electricity. These phrases are absolutely absurd; they are meaningless, for chemistry and electricity and navigation take no account of religion.

CATHOLIC SCIENTISTS

As a result of all this we see that no established truth or fact of science can in any way injure the Catholic Church. Church authorities invoke a heavenly benediction upon all who are laboring in the fields of science, and the Church prays that they may continue to widen out the borders of science, and push its frontiers into ever new and inviting fields of achievement. Many of the world's great scientists were Catholics, and some of them were Bishops and priests. On your next visit to Boston, as you go over Harvard Bridge to Cambridge, immediately on your right is the famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology, commonly known as "Boston Tech." That glorious pile of buildings has its cornice enriched with the famous scientific names of all past ages, and the most prominent name of all, the one outstanding word that fills your whole range of vision as you cross the bridge is the name of a Catholic, Copernicus. This is the testimony of the greatest scientific school in America, perhaps in the world, to the relations between the Catholic Church and modern science.

Write all you wish, says the Catholic Church to scientists, but keep out of the sacristy. Do not drag religion into your scientific laboratories, and do not attempt either to support or to ridicule religion when presenting your proofs to the world. Science and religion are as far as the poles apart, and they will remain thus separated, and there can be no antagonism between them.

Realization of a Great Catholic Ideal

IGNATIUS W. COX

Address to University Students on Personal Purity.

"Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God."

I AM not going to give you a sermon this evening, instead I wish to give you a serious talk on a solemn subject. We have been speaking about friendship with Jesus Christ, the most precious thing in life, and I have been led to my choice of subject by the consideration that all those who were nearest and dearest to Jesus Christ were supereminent in the virtue of purity, St. John the Baptist, the sturdy, rugged Precursor, Mary, the Immaculate Virgin, St. Joseph, the pure and spotless foster father, and St. John, who leaned upon our Lord's breast.

There is scarcely anything so noble, so sacred in life as that Divine institution, the human family. The mutual love of a pure man and a pure woman, the crown and consummation of that love, children given of God, these are at once the basis of family life, and the very pillars of human society.

So sacred is the relation between man and woman in the family that God has elevated this union to a Sacrament, and Christ compares it to the mystical union of Himself and His Church. Behind the screen of the family, there are sacred biological and physiological processes, which should be thought of and spoken of only with the deepest reverence, because they are at the same time the means by which God's little children are brought into the world and the basis of a deep, unselfish love which is found nowhere except in the bosom of the family. There is not in this big wide world a thing so wondrous as a mother's love, nothing so unselfish. A mother's love is absolute self-forgetfulness, self-annihilation, and the reason of it all is because the child is bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh and because it has cost her tears and pains and suffering.

It is about the sin which runs counter to all these things, that I wish to speak to you this evening, impurity, which is nothing else than the deliberate seeking of sexual pleasure by thought or word or deed outside the holy bond of matrimony.

The mysterious processes by which God's little ones are brought into the world are among the most sacred things in life. God punishes the abuse of them by His own special punishments. There is no sin that has not its punishment and evil effects in this world as well as in the next. Violent anger, repeatedly indulged, sometimes destroys health as well as the mind. Avarice dries up the joys of life and makes the avaricious heart as metallic as the yellow gold it seeks. Envy and jealousy are a cancerous growth, which eat at the heart of their victim and bring him and others to destruction.

These are perhaps the vices of those advanced in years. Impurity is the great temptation and vice of youth. It is a crime against ourselves and God. It is a degradation of our manhood. Impurity saps the strength and virility of youth. It darkens the intellect and enslaves the will. It blasts energy and aggressiveness and brings on an enervating and paralyzing lassitude. It drives its victim from the sunshine of life and the society of his fellows. The impure boy shrinks from the embrace of a mother or the touch of a sister. It leads its victim to morbid unhealthy solitude and dark thoughts and unprofitable remorse. The soul like a poor moth plays with the flame of impurity and falls a singed and blasted thing. In the end impurity brands its victim as but the shadow of a man and drags him down unresisting to damnation. All this not in a day or in a month. It may take years, but those years flit by on speedy, dreamy wings, and all that remains are bitter memories of a wasted youth and barren regrets for the purity and sunshine that might have been.

This is but a faint sketch of the vengeance which nature takes upon the habitually impure. The supernatural effects are worse. "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? . . . Or know ye not that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own? For you were bought for a great price. Glorify and bear God in your bodies" (I Cor. vi. 15, 19, 20). By Baptism and by the Eucharist we are one with Christ; He, the head; we, the members. By Confirmation, we are the temples of the Holy Ghost, who dwells in us in a very special way. We do not belong to ourselves. Christ has

bought us at a great price, His precious blood. Christ's immaculate body is our food, our lips are purple with the ransom of His blood. It is this sacred body, not our own but Christ's, which we dishonor and defile by impurity.

Purity, natural and supernatural, is a precious flower glorious with fragrance and hope and sunshine, to be guarded and preserved above all things. Impurity is a rank, foul growth to be avoided and rooted out at all costs. It would be easy to preserve purity, to root out impurity, if we were incessantly on our guard against the things which lead to impurity. What are the things leading to this vice in your present life?

First of all, perhaps above all, companionship. No one rises above his environment. You will not rise above the moral status of your friends. When a lad first comes to college he wants to throw himself fully into the life. He frequently seeks the companionship not of the worthy but of the conspicuous. He tries to be ultra-collegiate and in the effort loses the substantials for which he came to college and which the inconspicuous frequently gain. If he does not imitate the worst, he not seldom imitates the worthless. Hence idleness, that damning sin. He begins his college days in idleness and ends them in sin. It is idleness which throngs the street corners with vacant staring youth. It is idleness which leads to lengthy dangerous conversations. It is the idle spirit which pours out the golden hours of youth in useless, if not suggestive and licentious reading. -Modern literature, whether it be the daily yellow journal with its sex appeal in picture or story, or the triangle-story magazine or novel, strikes a deadly blow at purity. It fills mind and imagination with a host of unholy images which return again and again with relentless persistency to the attack until their victim is paralyzed and overcome. In the name of the God of purity is there not enough of bright and pure and wholesome literature without serving up all this inflammable matter to our passions?

There are two other things which I would mention here, mention and dismiss them; dancing and the theater. How often has the question been put to me: "Father, is dancing a sin?" You know as well as I do that circumstances make dancing dangerous and at times sinful. Circumstances of

place; if you attend cheap public dance halls, where you cannot choose your company but your company chooses you, then you know that you are endangering your purity. Circumstances of company, for much depends on the character of the dance and still more on the character of the one with whom you dance. If you indulge in the all too prevalent custom of the young today of drinking at dances you are adding another dangerous circumstance to the dance and preparing the way for sin. If you permit yourself unholy familiarities either at the dance or returning home in the taxi, it is useless to ask is all this sinful. As to the theater, if you frequent cheap coarse theaters and coarser plays, or even though the play is harmless, if you frequent second balconies where there are smoking booths and silly girls, then again it is useless to put the question is theatergoing sinful. Circumstances seem to constitute the real danger in all this.

These are some of the occasions and some of the things leading to impurity. You know others. Without a proper guard against all this it is morally impossible to be and to remain pure. The modern world has seized all the avenues of attack on the purity of youth and seems bent on destroying it.

Why should I be pure? Self-knowledge, self-reverence, self-control, these three make sovereign power. You know how the poet sang of Sir Galahad, "his strength was as the strength of ten, because his heart was pure." I ought to be pure out of reverence and respect for self and manhood, out of a desire to be master and not slave. I should be pure because I have ever before my mind the radiant vision of a pure mother and a pure sister. How you would blush and shrink if your mother caught you reading an impure book, if your mother should know that you were impure in thought or word or deed. During the war you probably saw on the screen the mother anxiously saying goodbye to her soldier boy. What was the thought uppermost in her mind? What was the fear tugging at her heart? What was her parting admonition? Was it thought or fear or admonition about physical danger? No, a thousand times no, it was thought and fear and admonition about moral danger and moral death! -- "My boy! If God brings you back to me, may you re-

turn as pure and spotless as you leave my side!" And the saddest aspect of the war was that the mother's plea was so often unheeded. How you would resent it, what stern measures you would take, and if you did not you were a cad and a coward, if some other boy was unduly familiar with your sister! By what right then, how dare you, be wrongly familiar with some other boy's sister? Do you want to be the first by undue familiarity to lead some good girl on the first steps of the downward path? Thousands of girls, once scions of good families, are walking the streets of this modern Babylon tonight, dead to themselves and dead to their families and dead to God, whilst those that lead them to their doom are priding themselves on their smug respectability. Cursed be the man or boy who gave them their first lead. A soul murderer is a thousand times worse than he who kills the body. "But he that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in Me, it were better for him that a mill stone should be hanged about his neck; and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea, Wo to the world because of scandals, for it must needs be that scandals come; but nevertheless wo to that man by whom the scandal cometh" (Matthew xviii, 6-8).

Why should I be pure? Because it means self-command, power, peace through victory in conflict. Because it means the priceless gift of the friendship of Christ and childlike intimacy with the Immaculate Mother of God. Because if I am not pure I have cast my lot with Satan and corruption and am not of Christ.

How shall I be pure? Easily! Will it! Will it by a proper care of those bodies of yours! Choose a hard life, not a soft one, a manly life, not an effeminate one. After you have spent hours in the close atmosphere of the class room, do not betake yourself to your room or to the street corner or to the moving pictures. That is softness. Be virile. Get out into the open. Face the cold and the wind and the storm. Take up some form of athletics. Do something hard, even unpleasant and grow up not soft and effeminate but hard in mind and body. Watch your companionship. The influence of a manly friend or a good girl is incalculable. Read worthwhile books, see worthwhile plays, listen to worthwhile music. Keep

your conversation, your imagination, your thoughts away from sex and sex problems.

These are natural means to preserve purity. The supernatural ones are still more important. I was reading the other day the words from a Protestant professor: "Religion is so fundamental and indispensable that without it the young, especially those of strong temperament, will strive in vain to live continently." Prayer is the shield of purity; prayer, reverent, earnest, sincere, humble, manly prayer; prayer in the morning, in the evening, during the day, and especially in the moment of danger and strong temptation. Strip yourself of the weapon of prayer and you are left naked to your enemy. And this is not cant but a fact of common, elemental experience. You can only learn the power of prayer by experience and that will teach you how prayer is the comforter and the fortifier of the will.

Purity is the sure offspring of devotion to the Immaculate Mother of God. It was the consideration of her spotless purity that brought forth a new concept of womanhood, lifted woman from the degradation of a true slavery to the position she occupies today and burst forth into the finest flower of the Middle Ages, a chivalrous respect for maidenhood and womankind. Friendship with Mary, childlike devotion to Mary, will hearten us for the struggle with impurity.

But above all our greatest help is in the Eucharist, "the corn of the elect and the wine that maketh virgins." Christ's body, part and parcel of my body, Christ's blood fortifying my blood, Christ's soul, strength of my soul, Christ's will energizing my will. Development of personality is the great slogan today. You cannot realize your Christian personality, you do not know what a larger, better, happier life is in store for you, until you have penetrated the secret, the power and joy of Holy Communion. The value of life is immeasurably increased, its power strengthened, its hopes enriched, when you have learned by *practise* the secret of frequent Communion.

Some years ago the Harvard foot-ball team journeyed from its Cambridge home to engage in play with the West Point Cadets. There was a Catholic lad playing tackle for the Cadets and after the game was well afoot it was

evident that the full weight of the Harvard crushing offense was directed against his position in the line. It was clear that the lad was weakening rapidly under the repeated charges but he was one of the best players on the squad and the coach refused to remove him. From the lad himself there was not a whimper, not a plea, but a stand-up fight to the finish, as he had learned to fight on another field. At last there was one more crashing attack through his position and the boy went down never to rise again. He stood up to the last and died a martyr to his youthful ideals. But he was a still greater hero in another field. The cadets at West Point knew that he had fought and conquered in a greater conflict. For when his body was laid out in the Catholic Chapel, each cadet came and laid on his casket a white rose, mute, powerful, eloquent testimony of a personal purity which had commanded their admiration when it did not provoke their imitation.

To realize the Catholic ideal of purity means a stand up fight to death. But it is a worthwhile fight. "To him who overcomes I will give a hidden manna." To be pure means an open, fearless face, straightforward eyes, an elastic step, a jubilant heart, and a soul alight with God's sunshine. "Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God." The pure of heart see God in nature, in the flowers and in the winds and in the waves, in the storm and in the sunshine. The pure of heart see God in mankind, for they are not cynics. They see God in human love and in human friendship. They see God in their bodies and in their souls. They see God in sorrow and in joy, in every place and in every circumstance. Their pathway is strewn with joy, the joy of living, the joy of loving, the joy of faith and hope and charity. Their joy is infectious, there is a benediction in their handshake and an absolution in their smile. "Christianity, the joy killer!" the impure pagan cries. "Christianity, the joy getter!" is the ringing answer of the clean of heart. The pursuit of one joy means the renunciation of many. There is not a joy the world can give like those it takes away. But purity brings joy in time and joy in eternity. "Blessed are the clean of heart for they shall see God." See Him in this world and see Him in the next. Life passes quickly,

old time is fast affleeting, all flesh is grass and all the glory thereof as the flower of the field. But at the end for the clean of heart the vision of God and of Jesus and Mary and the possession of such joy as "eye hath not seen nor ear heard nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive." "To him who overcometh I shall give a hidden manna." Are you now master or slave, victor or victim, are you blind or do you see, are you in darkness or in a great light? May that heavenly light flood your heart with its brightness, may it pour its golden iridescent beams in a glorious luminous flood into every nook and cranny of your souls so that you may see the vision, the vision of purity, the vision of God. "Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God."

The Meaning of Free Will

"The Examiner," Bombay

ONE of the subjects which is always cropping up is that of free will: whether we have it or not. The practical man finds no disposition to doubt the fact. The whole of our life and social system is based on the supposition that we are free agents; and that if we do what is right we deserve praise for it, and if we do what is wrong we deserve blame for it. Moreover, everybody recognizes that there is a distinction between actions which are free and actions which are not free. Thus if a man loses his temper and suddenly hits me in the face, and then apologizes and says, "I couldn't help it," I am quite ready to believe that, in such a state of sudden passion he could not help it. But if the same man, instead of hitting me in the face, goes and buys poison and administers it to me next day in a friendly way it is quite useless for him to say: "I couldn't help it." The different parts of the action are far too deliberately planned and carried out to admit of such a plea.

Still, though this distinction is obvious to everybody in practical life, as soon as people begin philosophical discussion they forget all about it. By the reading of determinist literature they have been overcome by the number of instances in which philosophers try to show that we act simply under impulse without exercising any choice; and they seem to argue therefrom that, if it can be proved that we are mechanically determined in some acts, we must be mechanically determined in *all* acts. In other words, they argue that unless we are free in every act we are not free at all.

Just the contrary is the case. It does not matter how many of our acts are determined by impulse or passion, or by the prevalence of the stronger motive. What we want is to find any one simple act in which we exercise self-determination by free choice. Even if we only perform such an act once in our lives that is an absolutely conclusive proof that we possess the faculty of free will; and if we can exercise it once we can exercise it many times, given the occasion and material on which to work.

This is a matter which can be tested at any moment: Thus the question before me now is whether, after finishing this note, I should go out or stop in my room. I can employ myself quite usefully either going out, or stopping in, and I don't feel any impulse or inclination either way. The only thing is I cannot do both, and have to make up my mind (that is, my will) which to do. At one moment the idea predominates to go out; at another moment the idea to stop in takes its place. At last I say: "I will go out," and so I go. Here I have made a deliberate choice between two alternatives by an act of free will. The determinist will probably step in and whisper: "No, you are wrong. The idea to go out happened to be more vivid than the idea to stop in, and that is what determined you." To this I answer: "Even if the idea of going out was stronger than the idea to stop in, still in making my choice I was conscious of being able to reverse my decision, and to stop in if only just for the sake of proving my free will."

It is the consciousness of the power to choose the *other* alternative, even when I actually choose *this* alternative, that constitutes the evidence of free will. This consciousness, being an intuition, is conclusive without any syllogism. Moreover, suppose it had been my duty to stop in. In that case, in choosing to go out, I should know that I was shirking my duty, and that I was responsible for shirking it. Being a perfectly cool choice, I should never dream of saying: "I could not help it." I should be quite ready to accept the consequences—namely, the blame which falls on me for shirking my duty. My sense of responsibility for such an act is just as clear and intuitive as my sense of freedom, and is only another aspect and corollary of it.

That is the case for free will in a nutshell. In common life (as we said before) no one would dream of questioning it. Such a perversity is only possible in the foggy atmosphere of an unventilated philosopher's closet.

Continuity Claim

The "Catholic Register," Toronto

EXCITED over the conversion of G. K. Chesterton to Catholicism and worried by the leading questions put to him by the *Daily Star* reporter, Archdeacon Ingles, of Toronto, states that the Church of England has never changed in its basic doctrines and is Catholic, dating back to at least 200 A. D. "At the time of the Reformation the Church was purged of certain evil practises which had crept in, but that is just like a man washing his face. There is no change in the man himself."

Let history settle the question. Let us put the thirty-nine articles to which Archdeacon Ingles gives assent and the Homilies which form part of the authorized teaching of the Church of England side by side with a solemn declaration of Faith drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the consent of the other Catholic or "Roman" Bishops and clergy in convocation in the year 1413. (Wilkins *Concilia*, Vol. III, P. 355).

THE ENGLISH CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

The Real Presence and
Transubstantiation.

The fayth and determination of Holy Church touching the blissful Sacrament of the Altar is this: that after the Sacramental wordes be sayde by a Priest in hys masse the material bred that was before is turned into Chryste's verray body; and the material wyn into Chryste's verray blode. And so ther leyeth on the Altar no material bred nor material wyn the which were there before the saying of the Sacramental wordes.

Confession.

Holy Church hath determyned that every cristenman living here bodily in erthe ought to be schryne (go to confession) to a priest ordeyned by the Church.

The Pope.

Christ ordeyned Saint Peter the Apostell to be His Vicar here in erthe: whos See is the Church of Rome, ordeyned and graunting the same power that he gaf to Peter shoulde succede to all Peter's

THE "CHURCH OF ENGLAND" AS FOUNDED AT THE REFORMATION.

The Real Presence, Transubstantiation, and the Mass.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. (Art. xxviii.)

Wherefore the Sacrifices of Masses in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits. (Art. xxxi.)

Confession.

And whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived, and do shamefully deceive others. It is most evident and plain that auricular confession hath not his warrant in God's word. (Homily of Repentance.)

The Pope.

The Queen's Majesty hath chief

successours: the which we callyn now Popes of Rome, by whos power in churches particular special he ordeyned prelates, as Archbysshopes, Bishopes, Curates, and other degrees to whom all cristen men ought to obey after the laws of the Church of Rome.

power in this realm of England unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm whether they be Ecclesiastical or civil in all causes doth appertain. The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England. (Art. xxxvii.)

Here we have before us two sets of doctrines. Are they the same? They are not. They are, however, the authorized doctrines of the two churches of England—the pre-Reformation Church and the post-Reformation Church. Are the churches that teach and believe these doctrines the same church? Has the old Church of England just a face wash? No; it is very evident that the Church of England of today is just a Protestant Reformation sect and had no real being until gotten by the "Virgin" Queen.